

Message Text

SECRET

PAGE 01 MOSCOW 13030 01 OF 02 121713Z

50

ACTION SS-25

INFO OCT-01 ISO-00 SSO-00 NSCE-00 CIAE-00 DODE-00 INRE-00

ERDE-00 ACDE-00 /026 W

----- 080825

O 121621Z SEP 75

FM AMEMBASSY MOSCOW

TO SECSTATE WASHDC IMMEDIATE 4378

S E C R E T SECTION 1 OF 2 MOSCOW 13030

EXDIS

E.O. 11652: XGDS-3

TAGS: PARM, US, US

SUBJECT: TTBT/PNE NEGOTIATIONS: THIRD PLENARY MEETING,
SEPTEMBER 12, 1975 - TTBT/PNE DELEGATION MESSAGE
NO. NINE

1. SUMMARY. IN PRIVATE MEETING BEFORE PLENARY MOROKHOV MADE SEVERAL GENERAL COMMENTS REGARDING US DRAFT WHICH WERE LATER AMPLIFIED IN PLENARY BUT IN ADDITION TOLD STOESEL US INSISTENCE ON USE OF SLIFERS WOULD CAUSE GREAT DIFFICULTIES AND EMPHASIZED THIS WAS QUESTION OF PRINCIPLE. IN PLENARY, MOROKHOV SAID SOVIET SIDE HAS JUST STARTED TO EXAMINE DRAFT TEXT. HE SAID SOVIETS HAD BEEN INSTRUCTED TO REACH AGREEMENT ON BASIS OF POINTS WHICH HE LISTED (POINTS CORRESPOND TO THOSE GIVEN ON JULY 24, REFTEL MOSCOW 10355). MOROKHOV SAID FIRST LOOK AT DRAFT TEXT INDICATED IT WAS IMPORTANT AND CONSTRUCTIVE. HE STATED THAT NPT HAS NO PROVISIONS FOR YIELD LIMITS ON PNES WHILE ARTICLE III OF TEXT DOES. HE SAID WORLD OPINION AND OTHER COUNTRIES WOULD NOT UNDERSTAND AMERICAN SIDE'S WORDING ABOUT COOPERATION. AGREEMENT SHOULD CONTAIN PROVISION FOR MORE SPECIFIC FORMS OF COOPERATION AND SOVIET SIDE WOULD PROPOSE SUCH WORDS. WANTED EXPLANATION OF THE MEANING OF ARTICLE IV OF TREATY AND SAID HE DID NOT UNDERSTAND THE PURPOSE OF ARTICLE VI. NOVIKOV, BEZUMOV, AND MYASNIKOV ASKED SEVERAL QUESTIONS ON DETAILS OF INFORMATION EXCHANGE, OBSERVER RIGHTS AND AGGREGATE YIELD LIMIT. STOESEL REPLIED THAT ARTICLE VI

SECRET

SECRET

PAGE 02 MOSCOW 13030 01 OF 02 121713Z

MEANT THAT AGREED-UPON VERIFICATION PROCEDURES MUST APPLY

WHEREVER EXPLOSIONS CONDUCTED BY US AND USSR TAKE PLACE, AND DEFERRED ANSWERS TO OTHER QUESTIONS. IT WAS AGREED THAT EXPERTS WOULD BEGIN MEETING TO WORK ON TECHNICAL QUESTIONS AND SAFRONOV WOULD BE SOVIET CHAIRMAN. MEETING OF TRANSLATORS AND EXPERTS WILL BE HELD MONDAY AT 1500 IN ORDER TO CLARIFY RUSSIAN TRANSLATION OF DRAFT TEXT. END SUMMARY.

2. IN BRIEF ONE-ON-ONE MEETING WHICH MOROKHOV REQUESTED WITH AMBASSADOR BEFORE TODAY'S PLENARY, MOROKHOV STRESSED SERIOUS PROBLEMS SOVIET SIDE HAS WITH OUR PROPOSALS ON "ELECTRICAL EQUIPMENT" (SLIFERS). HE SAID OUR INSISTENCE ON USING THIS TECHNIQUE WOULD CAUSE GREAT DIFFICULTIES AND EMPHASIZED THIS WAS A QUESTION OF "PRINCIPLE". MOROKHOV ALSO REMARKED THAT SOVIETS HAD TROUBLE WITH OUR PROPOSALS ON FUNCTIONS OF OBSERVERS; THIS WHOLE SECTION SEEMED TOO DETAILED.

3. WHEN AMBASSADOR NOTED THAT THERE WERE OTHER DIFFERENCES BETWEEN OUR TWO POSITIONS, I.E., ONE MEGATON VS. TWO MEGATONS AND QUESTION OF EXCEPTIONS ABOVE THRESHOLD, MOROKHOV AGREED. HE REMARKED THAT MATTER OF EXCEPTIONS WAS ALSO "QUESTION OF PRINCIPLE" AND WAS IMPORTANT TO SOVIETS, BUT HE SAID THIS WITHOUT ANY PARTICULAR EMPHASIS.

4. MOROKHOV CONTINUED THAT SOVIET SIDE HAD REALLY NOT HAD ENOUGH TIME TO STUDY OUR DRAFT IN DETAIL. HE THOUGHT THE SECTION ON COOPERATION WAS THIN AND NEEDED STRENGTHENING. THERE WERE ALSO SOME LEGAL QUESTIONS WHICH COULD BE DISCUSSED. OVERALL, HOWEVER, HE SAID OUR DRAFT WAS MOST USEFUL AND WAS A POSITIVE CONTRIBUTION.

5. MOROKHOV INDICATED HE WOULD BE AWAY UNTIL EARLY OCTOBER. ON HIS RETURN, HE HOPED AGREEMENT -- WHICH WOULD BE REVIEWED IN DETAIL IN INTERIM BY EXPERTS OF BOTH SIDES -- COULD BE "FINISHED UP".

6. IN PLENARY, MOROKHOV SAID SOVIET SIDE HAD EXAMINED DRAFT TREATY AND PROTOCOLS SUBMITTED BY US ON SEPTEMBER 10. IN EXAMINING DOCUMENT, SOVIET SIDE IS PROCEEDING FROM PRINCIPLES WHICH WERE EXPRESSED AT AN EARLIER TIME. HE SAID SOVDEL HAD BEEN "DIRECTED TO DECLARE ITS WILLINGNESS TO REACH AGREEMENT"

SECRET

SECRET

PAGE 03 MOSCOW 13030 01 OF 02 121713Z

ON BASIS OF SEVERAL PRINCIPLES; AND THEN REPEATED SEVEN POINTS OUTLINED IN RESTRICTED MEETING OF JULY 24, 1975 (SEE MOSCOW 10355).

7. MOROKHOV INDICATED HE FELT DOCUMENT WAS NEW AND CONSTRUCTIVE STEP TOWARD REACHING AGREEMENT BUT THAT NUMBER OF QUESTIONS HAD COME TO MIND DURING HIS FIRST READING OF DOCUMENT, AND HE FELT SURE THAT MORE QUESTIONS WOULD ARISE IN FUTURE.

HE PROCEEDED TO ASK QUESTIONS AND MAKE COMMENTS BASED UPON HIS READING OF TEXT, RESERVING RIGHT TO ASK MORE QUESTIONS AND MAKE COMMENTS IN FUTURE.

8. HIS FIRST COMMENT RELATED TO THE NON-PROLIFERATION TREATY AND THE NATURE OF REFERENCES TO IT IN DRAFT. HE NOTED REFERENCE IN PREAMBLE TO NPT, WHICH HE VERY STRONGLY SUPPORTS AND POINTED OUT THAT LIMITATIONS IN ARTICLE III OF THE DRAFT TREATY ON INDIVIDUAL AND AGGREGATE YIELDS WERE INCONSISTENT WITH PROVISIONS OF NPT SINCE THAT DOCUMENT DOES NOT IMPOSE ANY LIMITS ON YIELDS.

9. HIS SECOND COMMENT WAS ON SUBJECT OF PNE COOPERATION. HE NOTED REFERENCE IN PARA 2 OF ARTICLE VII, BUT REGARDED THAT REFERENCE AS TOO WEAK AND STATED THAT SOVIETS CONTINUED TO BE CONVINCED THAT COOPERATION IN PNE FIELD WILL HAVE GREAT VALUE IN FUTURE AND THAT, CONSIDERING OBLIGATIONS UNDERTAKEN IN ARTICLE V OF NPT BY THE TWO GOVERNMENTS, LIMITATIONS SUGGESTED BY US WOULD NOT BE UNDERSTOOD BY OTHER COUNTRIES WHO HAVE KEEN INTEREST IN PNES. MOROKHOV SAID THEIR DELEGATION WOULD SUGGEST SPECIFIC WORDING IN THIS REGARD.

SECRET

NNN

SECRET

PAGE 01 MOSCOW 13030 02 OF 02 121816Z

42

ACTION SS-25

INFO OCT-01 ISO-00 SSO-00 NSCE-00 CIAE-00 DODE-00 INRE-00

ERDE-00 ACDE-00 /026 W

----- 081865

O 121621Z SEP 75

FM AMEMBASSY MOSCOW

TO SECSTATE WASHDC IMMEDIATE 4379

S E C R E T SECTION 2 OF 2 MOSCOW 13030

EXDIS

10. MOROKHOV DID NOT UNDERSTAND PURPOSE OF ARTICLE IV WHICH HE SAID IMPOSED LIMITATIONS ON CONDUCTING CERTAIN PNES OUTSIDE THE TEST SITES AND THEN ONLY AS EXCEPTIONS. HE POINTED OUT THAT IT WAS WELL KNOWN FACT THAT PNES COULD ONLY BE CARRIED OUT IN PLACES OF THEIR INDUSTRIAL APPLICATION.

11. MOROKHOV DID NOT UNDERSTAND PURPOSE OF ARTICLE VI WHICH HE SAID, IN ESSENCE APPEARS TO PROVIDE FOR APPLICATION OF THIS BILATERAL AGREEMENT REGARDING PNES TO OTHER COUNTRIES AS WELL.

12. MOROKHOV THEN TURNED TO OTHER MEMBERS OF SOVDEL FOR THEIR QUESTIONS UPON READING OF DOCUMENT. NOVIKOV ASKED QUESTIONS RELATING TO ARTICLE III OF PROTOCOL I; SPECIFICALLY, HE QUERIED WHETHER INFORMATION RELATING TO SPECIFIC GEOLOGICAL STRUCTURE AND TECHNICAL FEATURES OF PROJECT LISTED IN SUBPARAS (E) AND (F) IS A FUNCTION OF YIELD. REGARDING SUBPARA 3(A), NOVIKOV ASKED WHY THIS WORDING WAS DIFFERENT FROM PREVIOUS AGREEMENT THAT SUCH AVERAGED GEOLOGICAL INFORMATION WOULD BE PROVIDED TO AVERAGE DISTANCE OF 2-3 TIMES CAVITY RADIUS.

13. BEZUMOV ASKED QUESTION REGARDING ARTICLE VI, SUBPARA 3(D) OF PROTOCOL I, STATING HE DID NOT UNDERSTAND THE ROLE OF REPRESENTATIVES IN SUCH CASES. HE ALSO INDICATED REFERENCE IN SUBPARA 3(F) OF THAT ARTICLE WAS FIRST TIME THAT SUCH A
SECRET

SECRET

PAGE 02 MOSCOW 13030 02 OF 02 121816Z

FUNCTION FOR OBSERVERS HAD BEEN MENTIONED.

14. MYASNIKOV ASKED REASON BEHIND AGGREGATE YIELD LIMIT OF ONE MEGATON IN ARTICLE III OF THE TREATY.

15. STOESSEL ANSWERED MOROKHOV'S QUESTION REGARDING TREATY ARTICLE VI BY STATING THAT VERIFICATION PROCEDURES WOULD HAVE TO APPLY WHEREVER EITHER COUNTRY CONDUCTS AN EXPLOSION, EVEN IF IN THIRD COUNTRY.

16. MOROKHOV REPEATED THAT THESE QUESTIONS HAD RESULTED ONLY FROM PROVISIONAL READINGS OF TEXT, SINCE SOVIET EXPERTS RECEIVED TEXT ONLY YESTERDAY, AND THERE WOULD NO DOUBT BE QUESTIONS IN FUTURE. HE PROPOSED MEETINGS OF EXPERTS TO DISCUSS THESE QUESTIONS DURING ABSENCE OF THE DELEGATION HEADS. SAFRONOV WOULD BE HIS DEPUTY FOR THIS WORK AND SUGGESTED IT WOULD BE USEFUL TO HAV MEETING OF TRANSLATORS AND EXPERTS ON MONDAY TO COMPARE TEXTS AND THAT NOVIKOV WOULD BE SOVIET TECHNICAL EXPERT. STOESSEL AGREED WITH THIS GENERAL PROCEDURE AND INDICATED US WOULD PROVIDE EXPERT IN ADDITION TO TUNIK FOR MEETING ON MONDAY.

17. MOROKHOV ANNOUNCED THAT A TRIP HAS BEEN ARRANGED TO KIEV AND CRIMEA, BEGINNING ON WEDNESDAY, SEPTEMBER 17 AND RETURNING ON TUESDAY THE FOLLOWING WEEK. SEVERAL SOVIET EXPERTS WILL ACCOMPANY US DELEGATION. STOESSEL THANKED MOROKHOV AND SAID DELEGATION ACCEPTS TRIP.

18. BUCHEIM SPOKE TO TIMERBAEV PRIVATELY AFTER PLENARY ABOUT ARTICLE IV OF DRAFT TREATY. TIMERBAEV SAID SOVIET SIDE COULD NOT UNDERSTAND ARTICLE; THEY HAD IMPRESSION IT WAS INTENDED TO BE VERY RESTRICTIVE IN SOME WAY BUT COULD NOT TELL WHAT IT WAS MEANT TO RESTRICT. BUCHHEIM TOLD HIM MAIN POINT WAS TO NOT PERMIT EXPLOSIONS OUTSIDE WEAPON TEST SITES FOR PURPOSE OF EXPLOSIVES DEVELOPMENT, BUT THAT US DRAFTERS PREFERRED NOT TO USE LANGUAGE EMPHASIZING PROHIBITIONS. TIMERBAEV SAID HE SAW INTENDED PURPOSE TO BE APPROPRIATE AND FELT SURE MUTUALLY SATISFACTORY LANGUAGE COULD BE DEVISED.

19. TIMERBAEV THEN SAID US DRAFT WAS VERY GOOD AND LOOKED LIKE BASIS FOR AGREEMENT; THEY NEED MORE TIME TO BE SURE OF SECRET

SECRET

PAGE 03 MOSCOW 13030 02 OF 02 121816Z

THEIR TRANSLATION AND TO ANALYZE TEXT; THEY WILL BE WORKING OVER THE WEK-END.

20. TIMERBAEV SAID IT LOOKED LIKE BIGGEST PROBLEM IS IN PROTOCOL II. BUCHHEIM ASKED WHAT FEATURE OF PROTOCOL II. TIMERBAEV SAID PROBLEM WAS TECHNICAL CHARACTERISTICS OF SLIFER. SOVIET EXPERTS SAID SLIFER COULD PICK UP INFORMATION ABOUT EXPLOSIVES THAT IS NOT NEEDED FOR YIELD VERIFICATION, AND THAT SOVIET "DISCRETE" TYPE INSTRUMENT WAS DESIGNED TO AVOID THAT PROBLEM. TIMERBAEV SAID SOVIET EXPERTS WERE PREPARING TO DESCRIBE THEIR CONCERNS IN AN EARLY MEETING, PROBABLY TUESDAY (SEPT. 16). BUCHHEIM SAID THAT WOULD BE FINE.

21. TIMERBAEV SAID HE WOULD RETURN MOSCOW SEPTEMBER 27.

22. BEFORE MEETING TIMERBAEV MENTIONED THAT SOVIET TRANSLATORS ARE HAVING GREAT DIFFICULTY WITH WORD "EVENT". STOESSEL

SECRET

NNN

Message Attributes

Automatic Decaptioning: Z
Capture Date: 01 JAN 1994
Channel Indicators: n/a
Current Classification: UNCLASSIFIED
Concepts: LIMITED TEST BAN TREATY, AGREEMENT DRAFT, PEACEFUL NUCLEAR EXPLOSIONS, NEGOTIATIONS
Control Number: n/a
Copy: SINGLE
Draft Date: 12 SEP 1975
Decaption Date: 28 MAY 2004
Decaption Note: 25 YEAR REVIEW
Disposition Action: RELEASED
Disposition Approved on Date:
Disposition Authority: ElyME
Disposition Case Number: n/a
Disposition Comment: 25 YEAR REVIEW
Disposition Date: 28 MAY 2004
Disposition Event:
Disposition History: n/a
Disposition Reason:
Disposition Remarks:
Document Number: 1975MOSCOW13030
Document Source: CORE
Document Unique ID: 00
Drafter: n/a
Enclosure: n/a
Executive Order: X3
Errors: N/A
Film Number: D750316-1093
From: MOSCOW
Handling Restrictions: n/a
Image Path:
ISecure: 1
Legacy Key: link1975/newtext/t19750958/aaaabyzr.tel
Line Count: 261
Locator: TEXT ON-LINE, ON MICROFILM
Office: ACTION SS
Original Classification: SECRET
Original Handling Restrictions: EXDIS
Original Previous Classification: n/a
Original Previous Handling Restrictions: n/a
Page Count: 5
Previous Channel Indicators: n/a
Previous Classification: SECRET
Previous Handling Restrictions: EXDIS
Reference: n/a
Review Action: RELEASED, APPROVED
Review Authority: ElyME
Review Comment: n/a
Review Content Flags:
Review Date: 11 JUN 2003
Review Event:
Review Exemptions: n/a
Review History: RELEASED <11 JUN 2003 by ShawDG>; APPROVED <24 OCT 2003 by ElyME>
Review Markings:

Margaret P. Grafeld
Declassified/Released
US Department of State
EO Systematic Review
06 JUL 2006

Review Media Identifier:
Review Referrals: n/a
Review Release Date: n/a
Review Release Event: n/a
Review Transfer Date:
Review Withdrawn Fields: n/a
Secure: OPEN
Status: NATIVE
Subject: TTBT/PNE NEGOTIATIONS: THIRD PLENARY MEETING, SEPTEMBER 12, 1975 - TTBT/PNE DELEGATION MESSAGE
TAGS: PARM, US, UR, (MOROKHOV)
To: STATE
Type: TE
Markings: Margaret P. Grafeld Declassified/Released US Department of State EO Systematic Review 06 JUL 2006